Attorney Docket: 501159.20501 (24228.03)

REMARKS

In the amendments above, Claims 1 and 17-20 have been amended, and Claims 14 to 16 and 19 have been cancelled, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicant's invention.

Claims 1-17 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and the earlier Amendment was objected to, due to the presence of new matter. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's position, the Examiner's attention is directed to the amendments above, where Claims 1 and 18-20 have been amended and Claims 14 to 16 and 19 have been cancelled. It's believed that the § 112 rejection and the objection to the Amendment have been overcome.

Also, Applicant confirms that the instant application is a **continuation** of the parent application, including embodiments of the invention that were expressly or inherently disclosed therein.

Claims 1-4 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner's attention is again directed to the amendments above.

The Examiner has rejected (1) Claims 1, 15, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Goodman; (2) Claims 1, 4, 14, and 18-20 under U.S.C. § 112(e) over Treptow; Claims 1, 3, 4, 14, and 18-20 over 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Treptow in view of Goodman; and Claims 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Treptow alone, Treptow and Goodman, and further in view of Raybuck.

Applicant hereby traverses these rejections.

Attorney Docket: 501159.20501 (24228.03)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the amendments above as well as the comments set forth in the file of the parent application, which issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,338,825, all of which are incorporated herein by reference. Applicant believes that the invention described in the amended claims is not disclosed or suggested by the references cited and that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting. Applicant disagrees that this rejection is sound. However, Applicant is willing to consider submission of a terminal disclaimer.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims herein are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Dippert

Reg. No. 26,723

Reed Smith LLP 599 Lexington Avenue 29th Floor New York, New York 10022-7650

Tel: 212-521-5400

Fax: 212-521-5450